

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN TENNISON,

No. C-04-0574 CW (EMC)

Plaintiff,

**ORDER RE MEET AND CONFER**

v.

CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Plaintiff John Tennison has filed a motion to compel which is set for hearing on May 18, 2005. Based on the Court's review of the papers filed by Mr. Tennison, it appears that the vast majority of the meet and confers have taken place by letter. This is in violation of the Court's standing order on discovery procedures, which requires in-person meet and confers, except where good cause is shown why a telephone meet and confer is adequate.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, the Court hereby orders the parties to conduct an in-person meet and confer by April 26, 2005, one day before Defendants' opposition to the motion to compel is due. Either lead trial counsel shall attend the meet and confer or counsel with *full and complete* authority on discovery matters.

///

///

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court also questions the adequacy of the parties' meet-and-confer efforts because it is hard pressed to believe that much, if not all, of the issues raised in Mr. Tennison's motion cannot be resolved by the parties without the need for judicial intervention.

1 The parties are forewarned that the in-person meet-and-confer requirement shall be imposed  
2 on all future discovery disputes, including but not limited to the motion to compel filed by  
3 Defendants set for hearing on June 8, 2005. Written meet and confers are not adequate.

4

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6

7 Dated: April 19, 2005

8

9

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
EDWARD M. CHEN  
United States Magistrate Judge

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28